

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,697	10/09/2000	Jeffrey J. Clawson	4289 P	3948
75	90 01/04/2005		EXAM	INER
Lloyd W. Sadler or Daniel P. McCarthy			UBILES, MARIE C	
Parsons Behle & Latimer 201 South Main Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 1800			2642	
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2218			DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/685,697	CLAWSON, JEFFREY J.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Marie C. Ubiles	2642			
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE MAILING DATE O  - Extensions of time may be ava after SIX (6) MONTHS from the - If the period for reply specified - If NO period for reply is specifie - Failure to reply within the set o	F THIS COMMUNICATION. ilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 e mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply ed above, the maximum statutory period w r extended period for reply will, by statute, e later than three months after the mailing	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH( 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed rs will be considered timety. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to co	mmunication(s) filed on <u>03 Au</u>	<u>ıgust 2004</u> .				
2a) This action is FIN	AL. 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.	<i>;</i>			
• - • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/ar 7) ☐ Claim(s) is	e rejected.					
Application Papers		·				
·	is objected to by the Examine					
	0) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
•	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §		animor. Note the attached Cinet	,			
•			) (d) or (f)			
a) All b) Some Some 1. Certified conditions of the application	e * c) None of:  opies of the priority documents  opies of the priority documents  he certified copies of the prior  from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receiv	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	(07.0.000)	, Distance 2	. (DTO 442)			
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Page</li> </ol>	(PTO-892) Itent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
· = ·	ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. This Application is now being examined by a different Patent Examiner; Marie Ubiles.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (US 4,237,344).

As per claim 1, Moore teaches a rapid response health care communications system" which reads on some of the limitations set forth in Claim 1 as follows.

The system of Moore is capable of rapidly receiving a request for health care from a patient on the basis of voice, telephone, visual, or emergency signaling" (See Moore col. 2, line 28). The Examiner finds that this capability reads on "receiving a medical call on a telephone communication device regarding a patient needing medical assistance." A telephone call initiated by the patient has the purpose of indicating his or her needs to the health coordinator, who receives this indication (i.e. description) (See Moore col. 9, line 10).

The health care provider (i.e. dispatcher) "upon receipt of the patient's signal (i.e. the description) ...can accurately and precisely make an informed decision on the degree (i.e. criticality value) of medical response required" (See Moore col. 3, line 59)

Moreover, the health care provider communicates (i.e. dispatcher) his/her decision on

Art Unit: 2642

the degree (i.e. criticality value) of medical response to the desired personnel (i.e. agents of the medical response (See col. 3, line 66).

After the medical staff has arrived at the patient location, they may "if necessary (i.e. based on said criticality value), effect further communication (i.e. post dispatch instructions) with the health care coordinator through the telephone. . .in the patient's (i.e. caller) room" (See Moore col. 10, line 15). The Examiner finds that further communication with the health care coordinator (i.e. dispatcher) in the patient's (i.e. caller) room reads on "post dispatch instruction to a caller."

Furthermore, the determinations set forth in claim 1, such as, determining if the caller is the patient and determining if said chief complaint concern hemorrhaging fall within the scope of standard medical diagnostic procedures and therefore, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Moreover, said patient having a chief complaint is a common circumstance and therefore, would have been equally obvious.

Regarding the newly added limitations wherein said determinations are made using a systematic pre-scripted interrogation of callers, thereby eliminating variability due to the different skills of the individual dispatchers and said criticality value is determined based on responses to preprogrammed inquiries . The Examiner takes Official Notice that the limitation reads on well-known procedures of pre-screening, through means of a questionnaire, in a triage area. It is well known that standard questions, such as chest pain, hemorrhage or concussions, are done in a methodological manner before determining which kind of help the patient will need.

Application/Control Number: 09/685,697

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claims 2-8, the ground of rejection, established by Examiner S.P.

Page 4

Mwanyoha in the Office Actions dated 7/18/2003 is maintained.

Applicants' arguments have been addressed in the above rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Marie C. Ubiles whose telephone number is (703) 305-

0684. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marie C. Ubiles December 21, 2004.

AHMAD MATAR

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Meno Mess

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600